



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/611,316	06/30/2003	Adrian Boariu	NC17653 9015.051	4006
7590 06/09/2005			EXAMINER	
Docket Clerk			GANTT, ALAN T	
Scheef & Stone	L.L.P.			
Suite 1400			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
5956 Sherry Lai	ne	2684		
Dallas, TX 75225			DATE MAILED: 06/09/2005	

. Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summan	10/611,316	BOARIU ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Alan T. Gantt	2684
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REI THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the may earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da iod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fror itute, cause the application to become ABANDON	imely filed ys will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. & 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30	<u> June 2003</u> .	
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☒ T	his action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under the condition of the condition.	•	
Disposition of Claims	•	
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the applicating 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without 5) ☐ Claim(s) 17-20 is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1.9 and 10 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 2-8 and 11-16 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	Irawn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam	iner.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □ a	accepted or b) objected to by the	Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to t	he drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr	•	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a light section.	ents have been received. ents have been received in Applicat riority documents have been receiv eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No red in this National Stage
Attachment(s)	. <u>-</u>	
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D	
 Notice of Draitsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12904. 		Patent Application (PTO-152)

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 9, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walton et al., in view of Dorne et al

Regarding claim 1, Walton discloses techniques to schedule terminals for data transmission on the downlink and/or uplink in a MIMO-OFDM system based on the spatial and/or frequency signatures of the terminals. A scheduler forms one or more sets of terminals for possible data transmission for each of a number of frequency bands. Thus, Walton includes a method for scheduling weighted transmissions from two or more transmit antennas of a base station to each of two or more mobile stations in a closed-loop transmit diversity system, the method comprising steps of:

determining the quantity of power available for data transmission from each transmit antenna; (paragraphs 0042,0059, 0168, 0174)

determining each combination of set of mobile stations that may be served simultaneously by a base station; (paragraphs 0056, 0063, 0070, 0085, 0154)

for each combination set, computing unused power .DELTA. with reference to the quantity of power available for data transmission from each

transmit antenna, and the power required to transmit data from each transmit antenna to each respective mobile station in the said set; (paragraphs 0042,0059, 0168, 0174)

for each of said combination sets of mobile stations, including said unused power .DELTA.; (paragraphs 0056, 0063, 0070, 0085, 0154)

determining the combination set of mobile stations that has a substantially minimum global cost; (paragraphs 0056, 0063, 0070, 0085, 0154) and

scheduling the transmission of data from each transmit antenna to the mobile stations which constitute said combination set of mobile stations that has a substantially minimum global cost. (paragraphs 0056, 0063, 0070, 0085, 0154)

Walton does not actually compute a global cost utilizing a global cost function.

Dorne discloses a resource management method and apparatus used in planning of resource deployment. Dorne is utilized for his teaching related to the global cost function.

Dorne meets the limitation –

computing a global cost from a global cost function with reference to one or more variables (paragraphs 0126 and 0166)

Walton and Dorne are combinable because they share a common endeavor, namely, choosing a best combination. At the time of the applicant's invention it would have been

obvious to modify Walton to utilize computation of a global cost from a global cost function with reference to one or more variables as done by Dorne to better quantify the choices of the best combination set of mobile terminals.

Regarding claim 9, Walton meets the limitation - The method of claim 1, wherein the power required by each mobile station is quantized. (paragraphs 0042 and 0059)

Regarding claim 10, Walton discloses techniques to schedule terminals for data transmission on the downlink and/or uplink in a MIMO-OFDM system based on the spatial and/or frequency signatures of the terminals. A scheduler forms one or more sets of terminals for possible data transmission for each of a number of frequency bands. Thus, Walton includes a base station comprising:

two or more transmit antennas, each of which comprises a quantity of power available for the transmission of data; (paragraphs 0042, 0059, 0168, 0174 -code is obviously required to carry out these functions)

an electronic data processor adapted for executing program code, said processor being connected to said two or more, transmit antennas and being configured for configuring data for transmission via said two or more transmit antennas; (paragraphs 245-265, 270-280, 312, and 313)

a memory connected to said processor, the memory comprising:

program code for determining each combination of set of mobile stations that may be served simultaneously by a base station; (paragraphs 0056, 0063, 0070, 0085, 0154)

program code for computing, for each combination of set of mobile stations, unused power DELTA. with reference to the quantity of power, available for data transmission from each transmit antenna, and the power required to transmit data from each transmit antenna to each respective mobile station in the said set; (paragraphs 0042,0059, 0168, 0174 –code is obviously required to carry out these functions)

program code for computing, for each of said combination sets of mobile stations, including said unused power .DELTA.; (paragraphs 0056, 0063, 0070, 0085, 0154)

program code for determining the combination set of mobile stations that has a substantially minimum global cost; (paragraphs 0056, 0063, 0070, 0085, 0154) and

program code for scheduling the transmission of data from each transmit antenna to the mobile stations which constitute said combination set of mobile stations that has a substantially minimum global cost. (paragraphs 0056, 0063, 0070, 0085, 0154)

Walton does not actually compute a global cost utilizing a global cost function.

Dorne discloses a resource management method and apparatus used in planning of resource deployment. Dorne is utilized for his teaching related to the global cost function.

Dorne meets the limitation —

computing a global cost from a global cost function with reference to one or more variables (paragraphs 0126 and 0166)

Walton and Dorne are combinable because they share a common endeavor, namely, choosing a best combination. At the time of the applicant's invention it would have been obvious to modify Walton to utilize computation of a global cost from a global cost function with reference to one or more variables as done by Dorne to better quantify the choices of the best combination set of mobile terminals.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 17-20 are allowed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding claim 17, the level of details outlining the closed loop transmit diversity system distinguished applicant's system and was neither found, suggest, nor made evident by f the prior art.

Claims 2-8 and 11-16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding the claims, the details were neither found, suggested, nor made evident by the prior art.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Hottinen discloses a data transfer method for a mobile communication system enabling the use of closed loop radio resource control schemes in radio systems with insufficient signaling resources.

Luschi et al. discloses a method of sending control information in a wireless telecommunication network

Hamalainen et al. discloses a method in a communication system that is adapted to provide communication channels for transmission of information to user equipment in time frames such that information to a plurality of user equipment can be multiplexed into a time frame.

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be addressed to Alan Gantt at telephone number (571) 272-7878. The examiner can normally be reached between 9:30 AM and 6 PM within the Eastern Time Zone. The group FAX number is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to this application should be directed to Supervisory Patent Examiner Nay Maung at telephone number (571) 272-7882.

Alan T. Gantt

May 14, 2005

NICK CORSARO PRIMARY EXAMINER